REMARKS

Applicant has thoroughly considered the Examiner's remarks in the January 22, 2008 Office action and have amended the application to more clearly set forth aspects of the invention. This Amendment C amends claims 1, 6-9, 11, 15, 20-23, 25, 29, 42, 48, 54, and 60-62 and cancels claims 3-5, 17-19, 30, 32, 36-41, and 44. Claims 10, 12, 24, 33, 45, 49-51, and 56-57 have been previously canceled.

Claims 1, 2, 6-9, 11, 13-16, 20-23, 25-29, 31, 34, 35, 42, 43, 46- 48, 52-55, and 58-62 are thus presented in the application for further examination. Reconsideration of the application as amended and in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claim Objections

With respect to claim 25, the claim has been amended per the Examiner's suggestion and the objection should be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 because of insufficient antecedent basis for the element "looking up." The claim has been amended to recite "wherein the sending comprises..." and, thus, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-9, 11, 13-23, 25-32, 34-38, 4044, 4648, 52-55 and 58-62 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bandini et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 7,117,358), hereinafter "Bandini", in view of Kester et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 7,194,464), hereinafter "Kester".

Bandini teaches a system of rating emails based on URLS and other attributes of an email. (Column 4, lines 7-10). In particular Bandini teaches a running comparison score based on a set of evaluations. (FIG. 3, column 4, lines 42-44). The evaluation results are added to the **running** comparison score and **if the running comparison score exceeds the SPAM threshold level, the evaluations are halted and the message is reported as SPAM**. (FIG. 3, column 4, lines 45-60).

Kester teaches a system and method configured to receive the identifier (URL), and to allow or deny access to the Internet website/page associated with the identifier, using a master

database of identifiers along with one or more categories associated with each identifier (Kester, column 1, line 53 - column 2, line 12). Specifically, Kester teaches that categorization can be based upon word analysis, adaptive learning systems, and image analysis. (Kester, column 8, lines 3-25).

Claim 1, as amended, recites:

> **rating each identified URL as appropriate or inappropriate** as a function of the identified category corresponding to each identified URL;
> **routing** the electronic communication as a function of **the rating of each URL**,
> wherein the **electronic communication is not routed** to an addressee **if the percentage of identified inappropriate URLs of the electronic communication relative to the total of identified inappropriate URLs of the electronic communication and identified appropriate URLs of the electronic communication is greater than a threshold amount**, and
> wherein **the electronic communication** is routed to an addressee **if the percentage of identified inappropriate URLs of the electronic communication relative to the total of identified inappropriate URLs of the electronic communication and identified appropriate URLs of the electronic communication is less than or equal to a threshold amount**.

For example, the percentage of inappropriate URLs may determine the handling of the electronic communication. (Specification, page 8, paragraph 34). If the percentage of inappropriate URLs meets or exceeds a threshold level (e.g., 50% or 10% or some other percentage), access to the electronic communication is limited to system administrators (e.g. parents) only and the electronic communication would be routed to the system administrator to a location where the administrator could access it but where client could not access it. (Specification, page 8, paragraph 34). **In other words, the electronic communication is not routed to an addressee when the percentage of inappropriate URLs relative to the total of inappropriate and appropriate URLs of the electronic communication is greater than a threshold amount.**

Writing for the Supreme Court, Justice Anthony Kennedy observed that a patent claim is invalid for obviousness when the invention combines familiar elements according to known methods to produce no more than predictable results. *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.* U.S., No. 04-1350, 4/30/07. However, in this rejection, neither the **element** of **rating each identified URL as appropriate or inappropriate as a function of identified category corresponding to each identified URL** nor the **results** of **the electronic communication is not routed to an**

addressee if the percentage of identified inappropriate URLs of the electronic communication relative to the total of identified inappropriate URLs of the electronic communication and identified appropriate URLs of the electronic communication is greater than a threshold amount and **the electronic communication is routed to an addressee if the percentage of identified inappropriate URLs of the electronic communication relative to the total of identified inappropriate URLs of the electronic communication and identified appropriate URLs of the electronic communication is less than or equal to a threshold amount** are found in the combined art.

In view of the foregoing, applicants submit that independent claim 1 is allowable over the cited art. Claims 2, 6-9, 11, 13 and 14 depend from claim 1 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Claims 15, 29, 42, 48, 54, 60, 61, and 62 have been similarly amended as claim 1 and is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Claims 16, 20-23, 25-28, 31, 34, 35, 43, 46, 47, 52, 53, 55, 58, and 59 depend from claims 15, 29, 42, 48, and 54, respectively, and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claims 15, 29, 42, 48, and 54.

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits that the claims are allowable for at least the reasons set forth herein. Applicant thus respectfully submit that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance and respectfully request favorable reconsideration of this application.

Although the prior art made of record and not relied upon may be considered pertinent to the disclosure, none of these references anticipates or makes obvious the recited aspects of the invention. The fact that Applicant may not have specifically traversed any particular assertion by the Office should not be construed as indicating Applicant's agreement therewith.

Applicant wishes to expedite prosecution of this application. If the Examiner deems the application to not be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited and encouraged to telephone the undersigned to discuss making an Examiner's amendment to place the application in condition for allowance.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency or overpayment of any required fee during the entire pendency of this application to Deposit Account No. 19-1345.

Respectfully submitted,

/Frank R. Agovino/

Frank R. Agovino, Reg. No. 27,416
SENNIGER POWERS
One Metropolitan Square, 16th Floor
St. Louis, Missouri 63102
(314) 231-5400

FRA/BAW/cjl